

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/506,790	09/07/2004	Alain Jordan	2004_1361A	3508	
35023 7590 LUCE, FORWAR	0 03/27/200° D, HAMILTON & S		EXAMINER		
	IO REAL, SUITE 20		LACYK, JOHN P ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
SAN DIEGO, CA					
			3735		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PE	ERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTI	HS	03/27/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

·			(M)				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/506,790	JORDAN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	John P. Lacyk	3735					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO , cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status	•						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 D</u>	<u>ecember 2006</u> .	•					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merit	s is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims		•					
4) Claim(s) 1-14 and 18-21 is/are pending in the	application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14 and 18-21</u> is/are rejected.							
•	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.						
Application Papers	•						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	nriority under 35 H S C	8 110(a) ₋ (d) or (f)					
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 33 0.3.0.	3 1 19(a)-(a) or (i).	•				
2. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No	•				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have bee	n received in this National Stage	;				
application from the International Burea							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
·							
A March are worter)							
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· A) T Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/21/06.	5) Notice of 6) Other: _	Informal Patent Application					

Application/Control Number: 10/506,790 Page 2

Art Unit: 3735

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-14 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dargent et al (6,547,801) in view of Mass et al (6,889,086) and Sayet et al (6,527,701).

Dargent et al discloses a gastric constriction device that have a moveable member that is moved by a motor to control the amount of constriction of the band. The device is controlled by an external controller. Dargent et al discloses the claimed device except for specifically stating the use of a stepper motor and the use of passive telemetry. Sayet et al discloses a constricting member within the body to control the amount of constriction exerted by the constricting member. Sayet et al teaches that it is well known to use a stepper motor as an activating member to control the amount of constriction of the device. Therefore a modification of Dargent et al such the the motor used is specifically a stepper motor would have been obvious in view of Sayet et al which shows that stepper motors are specifically known in deivces implanted in the body to control movement of a constricting device. Mass et al teaches the use of passive telemetry is well known to communicate with and control implantable medical devices and discloses the advantages of the passive telemetry system over commonly known external telemetry systems (column 1, line 45- column 2, line 41). Therefore a modification of Dargent et al such that a passive telemetry system is substituted for the

Application/Control Number: 10/506,790

Art Unit: 3735

remote telemetry system of Dargent et al would have been obvious in view of the teachings of Mass et al.

Applicant's arguments filed 12/21/06 have been fully considered but they are not 3. persuasive. Applicant argues that none of the references teach a passive telemetry system that uses a stepper motor without processing by a microprocessor. Firstly the claims do not contain any limitations that the device does not contain a microprocessor. Claim 1, for one example only, includes a stepper motor, a moveable member, an oscillator where the external controller that uses passive telemetry to operate the device. As can be seen in the rejection Dargent et al discloses the device except for specifically using a stepper motor and passive telemetry. The secondary references to Mass et al and Savet et al further teach the use of stepper motors and passive telemetry in similar devices as shown in the rejection. Therefore the rejection is still considered to be proper. Further applicant argues that neither Mass or Sayet teach actuation of a moveable member in an intracorporeal device by passive telemetry, however the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). Clearly, as discussed in the above rejection, the references

Art Unit: 3735

to Mass and Sayet teach the well known use of stepper motors and passive telemetry in devices that are implanted into the body.

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Lacyk whose telephone number is 571-272-4728. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chuck Marmor, II can be reached on 571-272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/506,790

Art Unit: 3735

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John P Lacyk
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3735

J.P. Lacyk